



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/628,003	07/28/2000	Kaname Nihei	0905-0242P-SP	3113

2292 7590 10/27/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

LINTON, HEDLEY O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2615	3

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/628,003

Applicant(s)

NIHEI, KANAME

Examiner

Hedley Linton

Art Unit

2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al (US Patent No: 6529644) in view of Hoffman (COMPCON '95) and further in view of Vong et al (US Patent No: 6209011).

3. Regarding claim 1, Ito et al disclose an image processing system that includes an image capture system that relates to a photo booth for processing and printing an image and collecting the designated monies for such processing and printing operations. The image capture system includes an image capture unit for capturing image data representing an image, a display unit for displaying the image captured by the image capture unit, and a recording control unit for executing at least one of processing for recording the image data, which has been captured by the image capture unit, on a portable recording medium and processing for recording an image represented by the image data, which has been captured by the image capture unit, on a visible recording medium (Ito et al figure 26, items 11, 80, 12, and 16). A video tape deck may be provided to terminal 80 of figure 26 in order to process an image recorded on a video-tape and since a video tape is both a visible and portable recording medium, and clearly the control unit 16 of Ito et al executes the processing of the captured

images, then control unit 16 meets the limitations of the recording control unit as set forth in claim 1.

Further disclosed by Ito et al is coin detector unit 19 that detects a coin and signals the system control unit to enable power up of the device. This comprises a command input unit for applying a use verification command that verifies use of the image capture unit. The external terminal connection detector unit 22 provided in Ito et al, which detects whether a device is connected to the external video input terminal 80, is clearly a determination unit for determining whether the input/output unit has been connected to the input/output interface (Ito et al column 12, lines 5-14). Finally a synchronizing signal detector for issuing a detection signal if it detects a signal on external video input terminal 80 is provided (column 12, lines 43-46). Note that the applicant admits to input/output devices being part of a photo booth system in the prior art and that a video-tape is interpreted by the office as an input/output device since images inputted to the video tape are outputted for image processing.

Ito et al do not disclose that the connection of the video tape deck to terminal 80 is hot pluggable nor does Ito et al disclose a notification unit for giving notification that input/output of an image by an input/output unit connected to the input/output interface is possible when the use verification command has been applied from the command input unit and the determination unit has determined that the input/output unit has been connected, and for giving notification that an input/output unit can be connected to the input/output interface when the determination unit has determined that the input/output unit has not been connected. However, it is well known in the art to provide a hot

pluggable input/output interface for connecting external I/O devices to a system and Hoffman discloses in a paper presented at COMPCON '95 that an IEEE 1394 high-speed serial bus may be used to provide a truly universal input/output connection between a video device and a computer. It is hot pluggable, and provides an inexpensive connection method. Further, it is well known in the art to provide notification to a user of whether an electronic device (external or internal to a system) is connected and available thereby notifying a user whether a device may be connected. Vong et al disclose an electronic device that incorporates an external notification system and teaches that it would be advantageous to have a notification system for electronic devices that notifies a user when an event occurs regardless whether the device is on or off and remains active until the user acknowledges it. Included in the notifications provided in Vong et al teachings are NOTIFICATION_EVENT_NET_CONNECT (when a network connection is made) and NOTIFICATION_EVENT_NET_DISCONNECT (when a network is disconnected).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an IEEE 1394 high-speed serial bus as the means of connecting the external device to the system in Ito et al since it is fast and inexpensive and to further modify the synchronizing signal detector in Ito et al to include a notification system as taught by Vong et al thereby forming a notification unit as recited in claim 1 since it would be advantageous to provide notification of an event to a user whether the device is turned on or off and thus a user could verify whether the external device is connected and available even while the system is shut down.

4. Regarding claim 2, see examiner's comments on claim 1 and note that since the coin detector in Ito et al detects a coin and sends a coin insertion signal to the control unit 16 to enable powering up of the system, then this coin detector (command input unit) verifies that part of a user fee is paid, namely the inserted coin, and is therefore a verification unit for verifying that at least part of a user fee for using the image capture system has been paid.

5. Regarding claim 3, see and apply examiner's comments on claim 1 above.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Massarsky US Patent No: 6385628

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hedley Linton whose telephone number is (703) 305-4693. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-6:30pm, Mon-Thu; 9am-5:30pm every other Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Christensen can be reached on (703) 308-9644. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (305) 305-4700.

Application/Control Number: 09/628,003
Art Unit: 2615

Page 6

Hedley Linton
Examiner
Art Unit 2615
October 9, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andrew Christensen', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

ANDREW CHRISTENSEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600